

Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

	TO BE GO	MPLETED	BY PLANNING STAFF.	
FILENUMBER			COUNCIL DISTRICT	DATE
QUAD#	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN		BY
REZONING FILE NUMB	BER			
			ED/BY APPLICANT INTORTYRE)	
ADDRESS OF PROPER PROTESTED 556	CAMBRIAN DE	z, CAM	PBELL, CA 9500	ზ
ASSESSOR'S PARCEL	NUMBER(S) 3 - 21 - 07-3 - (·	,	
REASON OF PROTEST I protest the propose ADDREGG FOR POLICE AND TO GAN IT The property in while still still attended att. (description)	red rezoning because S OVER FLFTY MEDICAL REGIONS OSE . Us ch I own en undivided into	EARS PONSE To se separate se se separate s	. I FEAR TRETERIO IMEG AND SERVIC theat if necessary east 51%, and on behalf of white	ch this protest is being filed,
	L NUMBER -	378.		
			ibed in the statement above is	
Fee Int	est which ownership) hold interest which expir (explain)	es on		

SIGNATURE(S): OF PROTESTANT(S)

This form must be signed by ONE or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.

PRINTNAME JOHN HOTTA		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	(AB) 3-	1-8831
ADDRESS 556 CAMBRIAN DR.	CAMPBE	Sī C	ATE A	ZIPCODE 95008
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	- ,'		DATE /	2/10
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	Ś	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINT NAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	s	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	s	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Noterized)		-	DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		·
ADDRESS	CITY	s	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		<u>-</u>
ADDRESS	ÇITY		TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
Use separate si	neet if necessary	у		
		_		

STATE OF CALIF)			
COUNTY OF C	Banka Clara) ss.)			
acknowledged to that by his/her/the	before me, Nenderson me, Nenderson me that he/she/they executed the eir signature(s) on the instrument executed the instrument.	me(s) is/are subsets e same in his/her/	who proved to me cribed to the withi /their authorized c	n instrument and apacity(ies), and	
I certify under P paragraph is true	ENALTY OF PERJURY under fl and correct.	he laws of the S	State of California	that the foregoing	
Dia	5 my hand and official seal. ent M James Votary Public	,	(Seal)	Olané M. Jame Commission # 173 Notory Public - Call Banta Clara Cou My Comm. Sigher Apr 2	igazó Heinle Inty
STATE OF CALIF)) ss.)			
On	before me,		_, Notary Public, _i who proved to me		
acknowledged to that by his/her/the	nce-to be the person(s) whose nar me that he/she/they executed the eir signature(s) on the instrument xecuted the instrument.	same in his/her/	their authorized c	apacity(ies), and	
I certify under P paragraph is true	ENALTY OF PERJURY under the and correct.	he laws of the S	State of California	that the foregoing	
WITNESS	5 my hand and official seal.				
	lotary Public		(Seal)		
n n	NOTALY PUDITE				

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

- 1. <u>Prezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest</u>. The Prezoning is proposed in conjunction with and is a necessary prerequisite to the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
- 2. Prezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property Owners Requests. The Prezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 – an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning de-annexation), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
- 3. Prezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Prezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San Jose 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 more than 16 years ago and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Sente Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3565 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

	JUBEU	UMPLETED	BY PLANNING STAFF	476
ILENUMBER			COUNCIL DISTRICT	
QUAD#	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN		DATE
EZONING FILENUMI	3ER			BY
ADDRESS OF PROPER PROTESTED 7年	RTYBEING 4065	WAV		
ASSESSOR'S PARCEL	NUMBER(S)	· · ·		
AEA SON DE PROTEST	Γ	See Attack		
	u	lse separate :	sheetiinecessary	
The property in whi	ch Lown en undivided in cribe property by addre	nterest of at le ess <i>and</i> Asse	east 51%, and on behalf of whi essor's Parcel Number)	ch this protest is being filed,
1420	LIDIS WA	/		
porcel	# 414-04-	`07 <u>6-</u> ±	<u> </u>	
and is now zoned	R1-8	-	District. (in Santa Clara	a County)
The undivided inter	est which I own in the pr	roperty desc	ribed in the statement above is	a;
FeeInt	ierest (ownership)			
Lease	hold interest which expi	res on		
Other:	(exptain)			
	DDRESS OF PROPER ROTESTED / // SSESSOR'S PARCEL // // - & DEASON OF PROTEST I protest the propose	EZONING FILENUMBER TO BE TO BE DDRESS OF PROPERTY BEING ROTESTED	EZONING FILENUMBER FOUR ECOMPLE (RIEASER) DDRESS OF PROPERTY BEING ROTESTED (420 4065 WAY SSESSOR'S PARCELNUMBER(S) 414-54-036-00 EASON OF PROTEST I protest the proposed rezoning because See Attack (Implell his hern mit is situated at: (describe property by address and Ass 1430 4015 WAY Derival # 414-04-036-2 and Is now zoned R1-8 The undivided interest which I own in the property describe property (ownership) Leasehold interest which expires on	EZONING FILENUMBER TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT REASEPHINDORTYPE) DDRESS OF PROPERTY BEING ROTESTED

SIGNATE	IRE(S) OF PHOTESTA	(e) (e)		een total
This form must be signed by ONE or more over which such protest is fifed, such interest being remaining term of ten years or longer shall be an eligible protest site is a legal entitly other to duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity, petition shall be signed by the duly authorized members of the association.	g not merely an easement. A deemed an "owner" for purp han a person or persons, th When such legal entity is a	A tenant under a k poses of this prot e protest petition homeowner's ass	ease whic est. Wher shall be s cociation, l	h has a n the owner of rigned by the The protest
PRINTNAME	- A - 1 - A	DAYTIME		
ADDRESS D Janconno	CITY	TELEPH <u>ONE#4</u> ST	408 °,77 ATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Noterized)			DATE 9-6	15 <u>-</u> 10
PRINTNAME	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	СПУ	ST	'ATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME	<u> </u>	Daytime Teleph <u>one</u> #		
ADDRESS	CITY	ST	ATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		'
ADDRESS	CITY	ST	ATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		-	DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	СПА	ST	ATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADORESS	СПУ	ŞT	ATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		_	DATE	
Us	e separate sheet if necessary	<i>i</i>		·

STATE OF CALIFO	DRNIA)		
COUNTY OF	ante Clara) BS.)		
satisfactory evidence acknowledged to me that by his/her/their	before me, Uha M. Him Channon te to be the person(s) whose no te that he/she/they executed it r signature(s) on the instrument ecuted the instrument.	w ame(b) is/are subsc ne same in his/her/i	their authorized cap	n the basis of instrument and acity(ibg), and
I certify under PEI paragraph is true a	NALTY OF PERJURY under nd correct.	the laws of the St	tate of California th	at the foregoing
Die	ny hand and official seal. inl Manuels tary Public	سسة	(Seal)	DIANE M. JAMES Commission # 1733376 Notary Public - Californic Santa Clara County MyComm. Expres Apr 20, 201
STATE OF CALIFO)) ss.)		
On			, Notary Public, pe who proved to me or	the basis of
acknowledged to m that by his/her/their	e-to be the person(s) whose no e that he/she/they executed the signature(s) on the instrumen cuted the instrument.	ne same in his/her/t	their authorized cap	acity(ies), and
I certify under PEN paragraph is true as	NALTY OF PERJURY under nd correct.	the laws of the St	tate of California th	at the foregoing
WITNESS p	ny hand and official seal.			
			(Seal)	
No	tary Public			

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

- 1. Prezoning Payes the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest. The Prezoning is proposed in conjunction with and is a necessary prerequisite to the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
- 2. Prezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property Owners Requests. The Prezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 – an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning de-annexation), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
- 3. Prezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Prezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- 5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEOA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 585-3555 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

	-TO BE CO	MALETED	BY PLANNING STAFF	14.00 E
FILE NUMBER	ED C10-010	,	COUNCIL DISTRICT	PATE
QUAD#	ZÖNÍNG	general Plan		BY
REZONING FILE NUMI	BER			D1
			ED:BY APPLICANT	
ADDRESS OF PROPER PROTESTED	RTYBEING _339, 14	35/,/3	4,1373,1524	, 1510 Otypia Ane
ASSESSOR'S PARCEL 414-04 - 019	NUMBER(S) 9,020,021,023	2,003	61,1373,1524 Olympia Canber	Camden
LHEASON OF PHOLES			ment A J HAUE	_ /
Suce V Hx	iuse Sence 19	72 4	WORKED 1510-15	34 Camben
Senec 1960	JAM esties	f 9 Don	WORKED 1510-15 THEED TO CHANGE I	HSudene lie
CARS All th	Epople wolf Us	e separate s	sheel It necessary For a 17	YES I BEEN TELE
The property in whi	ich Town an undivided in	terest of at le	east 51%, and on behalf of whi easo <i>r's Parcel Number)</i>	
	YMPIDAUE LO		14-04-019)	1373 1414-04-022
' -	, , ,			152409414-04-003
<u> 136101</u>	YMPIA AVE L	01136	414-04-021)	+ HOSE 1510,
and is now zoned	R1-8		District, (in Santa Clare	a County) 414-04-004
The undivided inter	rest which I own in the pro	operty descr	ribed in the statement above is	a:
Fee Int	terest (ownership)			
leaseJ 🗌	hold interest which explin	es on		
Other:	(explain)	_		
-	. 		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

SIGNATURE(S) OF PROTESTA	NT(S)	
This form must be signed by ONE or more owners of an undivided interest which such protest is lifed, such interest being not merely an easement. A remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purp an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a repetition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association.	tenant under a l loses of this prot protest pelition lomeowner's ass	lease which has a test. When the owner of a shall be signed by the sociation, the protest
PRINTNAME BARRY L. BRACCO	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	408-396-3581
ADDRESS 1339 OLYMPIAAUE CAMPI	sell Si	ATE ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized) Barry Spaces		DATE 9-23-2010
PRINTNAME BARRY L. BRACCO	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	408-396-3581
ADDRESS 1351 OLYMPIA AUE CAMPOELL	, /9	TATE ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE 9- 23-2010
PRINTNAME BARRY L. BRACEU	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#1	
ADDRESS 1361 OLYMPIAAUE CAMBBE		ATE ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized) Sarry Stace	· .	DATE 9-23-2010
PRINTNAME BARR L. BERCOO	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	168-396-3581
ADDRESS 1373 OLYMPIAAVE CAMBELL	C_{AB}^{s}	TATE ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Noterized)	<u> </u>	DATE 9-23-2010
PRINTNAME BARRY L. BRAGO	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	408-396-3581
ADDRESS 1510 Camden Composition	Call.	TATE ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DATE 9-23-2010
PRINTNAME BARRY L. BRACOU	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	408-396-3581
ADDRESS CITY /		TATE2 ZIPCODE
	// CA1	T 9500K
SIGNATURE (Notarized) Signature Succes Succes	//_ Căr	


PLEASE CALL THE APPOINTMENT DESK AT (408) 535-3555 FOR AN APPLICATION APPOINTMENT.


STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF <u>SANTACIALA</u>)) ss.)
On 9/23/2010 before me, Sarry Louis Braco satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) acknowledged to me that he/she/they exthat by his/her/their signature(s) on the inperson(s) acted, executed the instrument	Notary Public, personally appeared whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and cuted the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(iee), and astrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing
paragraph is true and correct.	midder the laws or die State of California mar the foregoing
WITNESS my hand and official a	eal. PlyUSH DAVE Commission # 1892248 Notary Public - California Santa Clara County My Comm. Expires Jun 11, 20
STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF) ss
Onbefore me,	, Notary Public, personally appeared, who proved to me on the basis of
acknowledged to me that he/she/they ex	whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and cuted the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and astrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the
I certify under PENALTY OF PERJUR' paragraph is true and correct.	under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing
WITNESS my hand and official a	eal.
Notary Public	(Seal)

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

- 1. Prezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest. The Prezoning is proposed in conjunction with and is a necessary prerequisite to the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
- Prezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property 2. Owners Requests. The Prezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 - an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning de-annexation), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
- 3. <u>Prezoning Will Result in Annexation fhat Will Not Benefit My Property</u>. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Prezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 more than 16 years ago and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).





OLYMPIA AVENUE/LOIS WAY SEWER EXTENSION

LEGEND:

Proposed Sewer Extension Project Boundary Assessor's Parcel Number

113-22-009-



Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

	T0:B	E GIOMBRETED	BY PLANNING	STAFR	
FILENUMBER			COUNCIL DISTRICT		
QUAD#	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN		DATEBY	
REZONINGFILE	NUMBER	•			
	ŢΦ		ED/BY/ARPEIC	ANT	
ADDRESS OF PR PROTESTED	OPERTYBEING 4	DALL DALL	AS DRIVE	2	
ASSESSOR'S PA	RCELNUMBER(S)	41239			
Protest the p	roposéd rezoning becau	See Attach	ment A	·	
		Use separale s	heet If necessary		
	(describe property by		ssor's Parcel Num	half of which this prolest is b ber)	
		12-390			
and is now z	oned R1-8		District, (in Sar	nta Clara County)	· <u>.</u>
	d interest which I own in t	lhe properly descri	ibed in the statemer	nt above is a:	
₽ F	ee Interest (ownership)				
☐ r	easehold interest which	expires on			
	Other: (explain)	·			

SIGNATURE(S)	OF PROTESTA	NT(S)		
This form must be signed by ONE or more owners of an which such protest is filed, such interest being not mere remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a persoluly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) members of the association.	ely an easement. A en "owner" for purp son or persons, the ch tegal entity is a f	tenant under a poses of this pro protest petilion nomeowner's as	lease whic lest. Whar i shall be s sociation, t	h has a nthe owner of ligned by the the protest
PRINTNAME KON WETH SCHOOK		Daytime Telephone#	408-6	£23-2185
ADDRESS 40 / DALLAS DR	CHANDBE	2 ∫ s1	/	ZIPCODE 9500X
SIGNATURE (Motarized)	<u></u>	.,	DATE	22/10
PRINTNAME ANITA SCHOOL		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	408-	593-5176
ADDRESS 401 Dallas 10	Complete	el E	ME.	ZIPCODE 9500X
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	I		DATE	122/10
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		,
ADDRESS	CITY	នា	TATE	ZIPÇÕDE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY		TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY		TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	ÇITY		TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Noterized)			DATE	
Use separale	sheat if necessary			

STATE OF CALIFORNIA) COUNTY OF Santa Clara) 85.
On 2010 before ment will. A strike Notary Public, personally appeared who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.
I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.
WITNESS my hand and official seal. DIANE M. JAMES Commission # 1733376 Notary Public - California Santa Clara County My Comm. Express Apr 20, 2011
STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF Santa Clara 3 89.
On Sept 30, 2010) before me, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.
I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.
WITNESS my hand and official seal. WITNESS my hand and official seal. DIANE M. JAMES Commission # 1733376 Notory Public - Colifornia Santo Clara County My Comm. Expires Apr 20, 2011

(Seal)

Notary Public

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

- 1. <u>Prezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest</u>. The Prezoning is proposed in conjunction with and is a necessary prerequisite to the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
- 2. <u>Prezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property</u> Owners Requests. The Prezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 – an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy. (concerning de-annexation), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
- 3. Prezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Prezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- 5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"), the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 more than 16 years ago and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. <u>Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements.</u> Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



Planning, Buttding and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

	[B10]T	E COMPLETED: BY PLANNING ST	AFT 1
FILENUMBER		COUNCIL DISTRICT	
QUAD#	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN	DATE
REZONING FILE I	NUMBER		BY
		BE COMPLETED BY APPLICAN (REESERHINGORTYPE)	
ADDRESS OF PR	ODEDTVACING		_
PROTESTED	364 C.≀ RCELNUMBER(S)	urtner Ave. Can	100011, CA. 73000
лоосорОКЭPAI		2-001-00	
REASONOFPRO	OTEST '	•	
I protest the pr	roposed rezoning becau	See Attachment A	·
·		· 	
		Use separate sheet if necessary	
The property I	la which I own an undivid (describe property by a	ded interest of at least 51%, and on behal address and Assessor's Parcel Numbe	If of which this protest is being filed, r)
	414-1	oz-001-00	
	() /	<u> </u>	
and is now z	oned R1-8	District. (in Santa	a Clara County)
The undivided	1 interest which I own In t	the properly described in the statement a	above is a:
_/	-		
ĽĄĨ F	Fee Interest (ownership)		
L	easehold Interest which	expires on	
	Other: (explain)		

This form must be signed by ONE or more owners of all which such protest is lifed, such interest being not mere remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a perduly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) members of the association.	ely an easement. A an "owner" for purp son or persons, the ch legal entily is a b	, lenant under a l poses of this prote a protest pelition nomeowner's as:	leese which test, When a shall be sig sociation, th	has a the owner of gned by the te protest
PRINTNAME Autonius C. Len	· · ·	Daytime 40. Tele <u>phone</u> #	396	-5177
ADDRESS 364 Cartner Ave	CITY Camabel		ATE A	ZIP CODE 95708
SIGNATURE (Notarized) Mon Clar			DATE 9-23	1-10
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	-	<u> </u>
ADDRESS	CITY	\$1	ATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME	•	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	-	
ADDRESS	СПҮ	នា	ATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	•	
ADDRESS	CITY	នា	ATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME	-	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY		TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		.]	DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY		TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	

SIGNATURE(S) OF PROTESTANT(S)

Use separate sheet if necessary

STATE OF CALIFO	ORNIA)		
COUNTY OF \underline{S}	arta Clara) ss.		
satisfactory evidend acknowledged to m that by his/her/thei	te that he/she/they executed the	// who me(s) is/are subscrib e same in his/her/the	Notary Public, personally appeared opposed to me on the basis of sed to the within instrument and fir authorized capacity(les), and e entity upon behalf of which the	
I certify under PE paragraph is true a		he laws of the State	e of California that the foregoing	
Du	my hand and official seal.	\rightarrow	DIANE M. JAMES Committeion # 1753 Notary Fublic - Calife Santa Claro Coun My Comm. Expires Apr 20,	374 ornic dy
STATE OF CALIFO	DRNIA) .) ss.)	, ,	
acknowledged to m that by his/her/theli	ce-to be the person(s) whose na	who me(s) is/are subscrib e same in his/hes/the	Notary Public, personally appeared proved to me on the basis of ed to the within instrument and ir authorized capacity(ies), and e entity upon behalf of which the	
I certify under PEI paragraph is true a		he laws of the State	e of California that the foregoing	
WITNESS 1	my hand and official seal.			
No	tary Public		(Seal)	

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

- 1. <u>Prezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest.</u> The Prezoning is proposed in conjunction with and is a necessary prerequisite to the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
- 2. Prezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property Owners Requests. The Prezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 – an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning de-annexation), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
- 3. Prezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Prezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 635-3555 fax (408) 292-5055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

	i 'To B	DECOMBLETED BY RUANNING STA	ALL ALLE CONTRACTOR SECTION
FILE NUMBER		COUNCIL DISTRICT	
QUAD#	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN	DATE
REZONING FILE NO	UMBER		
		BE COMPLETED BY APPLICAN (PLEASE PRINT OF TYPE) ==	
ADDRESS OF PRO PROTESTED		375 Curtner	7,000
ASSESSOR'S PARC	CELNUMBER(S)	412- 39- 048	3
REASON OF PROT		use See Attachment A	
		Use separate sheet if necessary	
	lescribe property by	ided interest of at least 51%, and on behall address and Assessor's Parcel Number	;)
		Curtner ave.	
		112-39-048	
and is now zor	ned R1-8	District (in Santa	Clara County)
The undivided in	nterest which I own in	the property described in the statement at	bove is a:
∭ Fex	e Interest (ownership)		
Lea	asehold interest which	h expires on	
☐ Oth	ner: (explain)	· _	
			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

SIGNATURE(S) OF PROTESTANT(S)

This form must be signed by ONE or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in tieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.

PRINTNAME THOMAS L. DAVIS	DAYTIME TELEPHONE# 559 1604
ADDRESS 375 CIENTROIT AUD	STATE ZIPCODE
ADDRESS 375 CUTTOR TO AVE. SIGNATURE (Notarized) Shown To Buyer	DATE 9.23 - 10
PRINTNAME	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#
ADDRESS CITY	STATE ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	DATE
PRINTNAME	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#
ADDRESS	STATE ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	DATE
PRINT NAME	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#
ADDRESS	STATE ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	DATE
PRINTNAME	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#
ADDRESS	STATE ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Noterized)	DATE
PRINTNAME	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#
ADDRESS	STATE ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	DATE
Use separate sheet if neces	saky

PLEASE CALL THE APPOINTMENT DESK AT (408) 535-3555 FOR AN APPLICATION APPOINTMENT.

STATE OF CALIFOR	NIA)	
COUNTY OF San	Ta Clara) ss.)	
acknowledged to me	to be the person(s) whose r that <u>he/</u> sh o/they executed t ignature(s) on the instrume	who proved to me on the ba ame(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrum ne same in his/her/their authorized capacity(is nt the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of v	es), and
I certify under PBN/ paragraph is true and	•	the laws of the State of California that the	foregoing
Jan 1	rhand and official seal. Yey Public	COMM. EXPIRES JUNE 30, 2011 SENTE COMM. #1754619 GOMM. EXPIRES JUNE 30, 2011 SENTER CLARA COUNTY SENTER JUNE 30, 2011 SENTER JUNE 30, 2011 SENTER JUNE 30, 2011	S V. DELONG
STATE OF CALIFORI	NIA	SANTA	UBLIC - CALIFORNIA CLARA GOUNTY RES JUNE 30, 2011
COUNTY OF	·)	
On	before me,	Notary Public, personally	
acknowledged to me	that he/she/they executed t ignature(s) on the instrume	ame(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrum he same in his/her/their authorized capacity(is nt the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of v	es), and
I certify under PENA paragraph is true and	•	the laws of the State of California that the	foregoing
WITNESS my	hand and official seal.		
		(Seal)	
Nota	eg Public		

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

- 1. <u>Prezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest</u>. The Prezoning is proposed in conjunction with and is a necessary prerequisite to the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
- 2. Prezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property Owners Requests. The Prezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 – an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning de-annexation), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the amexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
- 3. <u>Prezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property</u>. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Prezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- 5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 more than 16 years ago and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjosece.gov/planning

	T/0 E	IE RECOMPLEMENT) HYPLANNING	ON APP	
FILENUMBER			COUNCIL DISTRICT		DATE
QUAD#	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN	<u></u>		BY
REZONING FILEN	UMBER				
	-n(o		n Engely Appelbio Punnan aver		
ADDRESS OF PROPROTESTED	OPERTYBEING 378_C	artner	Aue. Car	wobel	1 CA 9500
ASSESSOR'S PAR	CEL MURADEDIO		002-00		•
	posed rezoning beca	use See Attaci	hment Å	•	
I protest the pro					
i protest the pro					
The property in	which I own an undiv	Use separate	sheet If necessary	ehalf of whi	ch this protest is being fi
The property in	which I own an undividescribe property by	Use separate ided interest of at address and Ass	sheet if necessary least 51%, and on b sessor's Parcel Nur	ehalf of whi	ch this protest is being fi
The property in is situated at: (c	which I own an undiv	Use separate Ided interest of at address and Ass	sheet li necessary least 51%, and on b sessor's Parcel Nur Tump bell	shalf of whi nber)	ch this protest is being fi
The property in is situated at: (c	which I own an undly describe property by Curtner	Use separate Ided interest of at address and Ass	sheet li necessary least 51%, and on b sessor's Parcel Nur Tump bell	ehalf of whi nber) CA	ich this protest is being li
The property in is situated at: (c 3.7.8	which I own an undly describe property by Curtner	Use separate Ided interest of at address and Ass	Isheet li necessary least 51%, and on besessor's Parcel Nur Annual bell District. (in Se	ehalf of whi nber) CAA	ch this protest is being li
The property in is situated at: (c 3.7.8 and is now zo	which I own an undividescribe property by Curtycr U14-02-0 ned R1-8	Use separate Ided interest of at address and Ass	Isheet li necessary least 51%, and on besessor's Parcel Nur Annual bell District. (in Se	ehalf of whi nber) CAA	ch this protest is being li
The property in is situated at: (c 3.7 g and is now zo) The undivided it	which I own an undivides cribe property by Curtycr U14-02-0 ned R1-8 Interest which I own in	Use separate Ideal interest of at address and Ass	sheet li necessary least 51%, and on b sessor's Parcel Nur Curch hell District. (in Se	ehalf of whi nber) CAA	ch this protest is being li
The property in is situated at: (c 3.7 & and is now zo) The undivided if Fe	which I own an undividescribe property by Curtycr HIH-02-0 ned R1-8 Interest which I own in	Use separate Ided interest of at address and Ass	Isheet If necessary Ileast 51%, and on besessor's Parcel Nur Control bell District. (in Secribed in the statement	shalf of whitehearth of the control	ch this protest is being li

SIGNATURE(S) OF PHOTESTANT(S)

This form must be signed by ONE or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.

			_	
PRINTNAME Janice K. Schilling		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	(400)	772-1994
LIBROTERS THE EXCHITTING			ATE	ZIPCODE
ADDRESS 378 Crustner Ave. (Pampp.		ATE.	4 800 8
SIGNATURE (Noterized)			DATE /D	7/10
Janua Relative			. 1/5	1110
PRHITNAME C. Schilling		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	(408)	772-1995
ADDRESS 378 Curtner Ave Can	cory vobell		TATE Ps	ZIPCODE 9500X
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	1000		DATE / 2	7/10
MARIE DEMAN				. (/ (-
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	<u> </u>	
ADDRESS	CITY	ŞT	ATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		•
ADDRESS	СЛТҮ	ទា	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	sī	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	<u> </u>		DATE	
Use se parate shee	at if necessary			

STATE OF CALLED	ORNIA)
COUNTY OF	enta Clera) ss.)
satisfactory evident acknowledged to a that by kis/her/their	ice-to be the person(s) whose na ne that be /sMe/they executed th	Notary Public, personally appeared to me on the basis of arme(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and a same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and at the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the
I certify under PE paragraph is true a		the laws of the State of California that the foregoing
m	my band and official seal.	COMM. #1813285 Z Notary Public California S Santa Clera County My Comm. Expires Sep. 16, 2012
STATE OF CALIFO)) 58.)
On	before me,	, Notary Public, personally appeared
acknowledged to n that by his/her/thei	ne that he/she/they executed th	me(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and e same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and it the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the
I certify under PE paragraph is true a		the laws of the State of California that the foregoing
WITNESS:	my hand and official seal.	
No	otary Public	(Seal)

<u>ATTACHMENT A</u>

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

- 1. <u>Prezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest</u>. The Prezoning is proposed in conjunction with and is a necessary prerequisite to the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
- 2. Prezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property Owners Requests. The Prezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 - an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning de-annexation), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
- 3. Prezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Prezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- 5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



CITY OF SAN JOSE

Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Senta Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 1el (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6056 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

	, тові	COMPUTED	HY PLANNING STAFF	
FILE NUMBER			COUNCIL DISTRICT	DATE
QUAD#	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN		BY
REZONING FILE NUM	BER			
		WALLER OF THE STATE OF THE STAT	EDEBY APPLICANT	
ADDRESS OF PROPEI PROTESTED	ATYBEING	URTHE	ER AV	
ASSESSOR'S PARCEL	NUMBER(S) ~39~04/			
REASONOFPROTES	Г	 . •	ment A	
		Use separate si	heet if necessary	
is situated at: (des	cribe property by t	led interest of at le address and Asse	·	nich Ihis protest is being filed,
ansense	numbe	7 <u>412</u> -	- 39- 047	
benoz won ai bna	<u>R1-8</u>		_ District. (in Santa Cla	ra County)
The undivided inter	rest which I оwл in t	he property descri	bed in the statement above i	6 a:
∑ Feelm	terest (ownership)			
Lease	hold interest which	expires on		
Other:	(explain)			<u> </u>

his form must be signed by ONE or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for Alch such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a
emaining term of ten years or longer shalf be deemed an "owner" (or purposes of this protes). When the owner of
n eligible protest site is a legal entitly other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the

** * SIGNATURE(S): OF PROTESTANT(S)

remaining term of ten years or longer shalf be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.

PRINTNAME PAUL C SANTINA	DAYTIME 408 3776878		
ADDRESS CITY	STATE ZIPCODE 15E44 CA 95008		
SIGNATURE (Notarized) Lantena	DATE /22/10		
PRINTNAME SANTINA	DAYTIME 409 3776870 TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS CLORTHER AV CAK	LABELL CA. 46008		
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	DATE/22/10		
PRINTNAME	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS CITY	STATE ZIP CODE		
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	DATE		
PRINTNAME	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS CITY	STATE ZIP CODE		
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	DATE		
PHINTNAME	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS CITY	_		
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	DATE		
PRINTNAME	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS CITY			
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	DATE		
Use separate sheet if necessary			

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF Sanfa Clara) ss.
On SONO before me, Sono Notary Public, personally appeared who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.
I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.
WITNESS my hand and official seal. Witness my hand and official seal. Witness my hand and official seal. Scala Clora County My Comm. Expires Apr 20, 2011 Notary Public (Seal)
STATE OF CALIFORNIA) COUNTY OF Styla Clara) ss.
On Sept 30, 3010 before me, Nang-Mang-Motary Public, personally appeared Mang-Below Santina, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.
I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing

paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Notary Public

(Seal)

ATTACHMENT A

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

I protest -- and respectfully urge the City Council to deny -- the proposed Director Initiated Prezoning (File No. C10-010) ("Prezoning") that would result in the rezoning of my property to R-1-5 Single-Family Residence Zoning District upon annexation to the City of San Jose for the following reasons and with reference to the following facts:

- 1. <u>Prezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest</u>. The Prezoning is proposed in conjunction with and is a necessary prerequisite to the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
- 2. Prezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property Owners Requests. The Prezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 - an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning de-annexation), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
- 3. Prezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Prezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 more than 16 years ago and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



CITY OF SAN JOSE

Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Sente Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

TO BE COMPLETED BY PLANNING STAFF	
FILE NUMBER QUAD # ZONING GENERAL PLAN REZONING FILE NUMBER	DATE
TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT (PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE) ADDRESS OF PROPERTY BEING	
ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER(S) <u>イ/スー3</u> 9ーの29	1000 P
REASON OF PROTEST I protest the proposed rezoning because See Attachment A	
Use separate sheet if necessary	
The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of white is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number) $\frac{271DALLA5}{4/2-39-024}$	ch this protest is being filed,
end is now zoned R1-8 District. (in Santa Clara	3 County)
The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is Fee Interest (ownership) Leasehold interest which expires on Other: (explain)	a:

SIGNATURE(S) OF PROTESTANTIS)

This form must be signed by ONE or more owners of an undivided interest of at least \$1% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filled, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.

PRINTNAME JACK SPINLER		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	559-1	889
- CDDECC	CITY	ST	rate PA	ZIP CODE 76 Do S
SIGNATURE (Notarized) Jack Spin (en			DATE 9-	12-10
PRINTNAME ER FSA SPINLED	R _	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		-1889
ADDRESS 27/ DALLASUR. CA	M DBZ	7/	TATE 93	ZIPCODE 5 0 05
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	1		DATE 9-22	-18
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	<i>,</i>	
ADDRESS	СПY	នា	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME	_	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	ÇITY	S S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	ÇITY	Ś	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	_		DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	!	
ADDRESS	CITY		TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
Use separate shee	tif necessary	í		
<u> </u>				

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF Santa Clara ; ss.
On Sept 3d, 30/10 before me, Alexe Who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence-to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.
I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.
WITNESS my hand and official seal. Commission # 1733376 Notary Public (Seal) Diant M. James Commission # 1733376 Notary Public - California Sonta Clara County My Comm. Explose Apr 20, 2011
STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF Santa Clara Ss.
On Slot 20, How before me, A land Market Notary Public, personally appeared who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the
person(s) acted, executed the instrument. I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

(Seal)

DIANE M. JAMES
Commission # 1733376
Notary Public - California
Santo Claro County
MyComm. Saltes Apr 20, 2011

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Notary Public

ATTACHMENT A

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

I protest -- and respectfully urge the City Council to deny -- the proposed Director Initiated Prezoning (File No. C10-010) ("Prezoning") that would result in the rezoning of my property to R-1-5 Single-Family Residence Zoning District upon annexation to the City of San Jose for the following reasons and with reference to the following facts:

- 1. <u>Prezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest</u>. The Prezoning is proposed in conjunction with and is a necessary prerequisite to the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
- 2. Prezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property Owners Requests. The Prezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 - an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning de-annexation), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
- 3. Prezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Prezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- 5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 more than 16 years ago and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Flanning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



CITY OF SAN JOSE

Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Streat San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 585-3655 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

TO BE COMPLETED BY PLANNING STAFF
FILE NUMBER COUNCIL DISTRICT QUAD # ZONING GENERAL PLAN DATE BY
REZONING FILE NUMBER
TO:BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT ([FLEASE PRINT/OR/TYPE) - 2
ADDRESSOF PROPERTY BEING 281 DAW AS DR., 95008
ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER(S) 4/2-39-02-3
REASON OF PROTEST I protest the proposed rezoning because See Attachment A
Use separate sheet if necessary
The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being filed, is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number)
281 Incens Dr., Compett Ca 95008 412-39-023
and Is now zoned R1-8 District, (in Santa Clara County)
The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a:
🔀 Fae Interest (ownership)
Leasehold interest which expires on
Other: (explain)

~ SIGNATURE(S) OF	PROTESTA	NT(S)		an e
This form must be signed by ONE or more owners of an unwhich such protest is filled, such interest being not merely a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such it petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of members of the association.	an easement. A 'owner" for purp or persons, the egal entity is a h	tenant under a l oses of this prote protest patition omeowner's as:	lease which h test. When th shall be sign sociation, the	as a le owner of ned by the protest
PRINTNAME (M. I. S. Grasa		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS 28/ 10 sups DK,	CITY		ATE	ZIPCODE S00で
SIGNATURE(Notarized)	1		DATE /2	ho
PRINTNAME PARI Survivion		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS 28) DALLAS DR.	Corre	្ ឡ	ATE معر	ZIPCODE 7.にしょむ
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	1800		DATE /2	1/10
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		/
ADDRESS	CITY		ATÉ	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Noterized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	СПҮ		TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Noterized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	СПУ		TATE	ZIPÇODE
SIGNATURE (Noterized)			DATE	•
PRINTNAME	•	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY		TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
Use separate sh	eet if necessary			

STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF Soula Clara) 68.	
that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), a person(s) acted, executed the instrument.	or the entity upon behalf of which the
I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the	State of California that the foregoing
paragraph is true and correct. WITNESS my hand and official seal.	DIÁNE M. JAMES Commission # 1793976 Notary Public - California Santa Ciara County My Comm. Explice Apr 20, 2011
Notary Public	(Seal)
STATE OF CALIFORNIA)	
COUNTY OF SMA CHAR	•
before me, H.S. Wissenson S.	r/their authorized capacity(ies), and
I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the paragraph is true and correct.	M. S. LUCIO Commission # 1796411 Notary Public - California
WITNESS my hand and official seal.	Santa Clara County MyComm.ExpiresMay22,2012
_ Set our	(Seal)
Notary Public	

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- 5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 more than 16 years ago and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).